SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 (916) 263-5506 (916) 263-0594 FAX INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov

Seismic Safety Commission AB 16 Advisory Committee Minutes of Meeting October 17, 2002

Maintenance & Operations Center – San Diego Unified School District San Diego, CA

Members Present

Commissioner Stan Moy, Chair Commissioner Dan Shapiro Commissioner Bill Gates Bill Holmes, SEAOC Dick Phillips, EERI Thomas Duffy, CASH Steve Newsom, CDE Gary McGavin, AIA Lupita Cortez, CSBA

Members Absent

Commissioner Andrew Adelman Dennis Bellet, DSA Gini Krippner, CDF, State Fire Marshal's Office David Clinchy, Los Rios Comm. Coll. District

Staff Present

Henry Reyes Richard McCarthy Adam Myers Abby Browning

Interested Guests Present

Walt Schaff, DOF Keith Packey, LAUSD George Lewis, LAUSD Suzanne Reese, OPSC Engel Navea, OPSC Bob Dyson, Stedman & Dyson Patricia Heerhartz, DSA Ernest Silva, CANEC Brad Strong, EdVoice Jim Hackett, DSA Michael Perez, San Bernardino City USD Mark Nomen, The Steinburg Group Bob Arnold, San Mateo Union High **School District** Nitin Nakrani, City of San Diego Isam Hasenin, City of Dan Diego, **Building Official** Fred Shedeker, Alliance Eng. Of CA Tom Winter, Guest Speaker Jim Watts, Guest Speaker Richard Luke, Guest Speaker Ron Young, Guest Speaker Isela Lovato, Guest Speaker Mehendra Meta, DSA San Diego, Supervising Structural Engineer

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 (916) 263-5506 (916) 263-0594 FAX

INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov

Office



I. Call to Order / Introductions

Chairman Moy called the meeting to order at 10:10 am. The panel introduced themselves and Chairman Moy welcomed them to the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee.

Chairman Moy asked Mr. Tom Duffy for a brief update on Proposition 47.

Mr. Duffy briefed the Committee on the campaign and the current standings of the Proposition in the polls.

The minutes from the September meeting were approved as is by the Committee with two abstentions. Those abstaining were Bill Holmes and Gary McGavin.

II. Presentation by Steven Newsom, Architect, Department of Education

Mr. Steve Newsom began his discussion with explaining the Department of Education's role. They are involved with the review and approval of the acquisition of school sites by districts.

Mr. Newsom said that their office also looks at primarily student safety issues. He said the Department prefers several options so they can help the school district choose the best site.

Mr. Newsom also said that the Department suggests early involvement with their office to help with site selection. They are also responsible to the educational specifications. He mentioned that many of those factors, including classroom size, supervision capabilities, and science room sizes play an important role in acquiring a building for the conversion process.

In conclusion, Mr. Newsom suggested that the Department be involved early in the process due to the many other factors that accompany site selection.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Newsom for his presentation.

III. Presentation by Tom Winter, State Historic Building Safety Board

Mr. Tom Winter began his presentation by explaining the role of the State Historic Building Safety Board as protecting and sustaining the life of historic buildings.

He then mentioned the State Historic Building Code as an available option to owners of historic buildings. Also, Mr. Winter mentioned that DSA has recently recognized that historic schools can be upgraded to fit into the historic building code.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 (916) 263-5506 (916) 263-0594 FAX

INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov

Mr. Winter said that one of the concerns of this endeavor was that sites which are considered options to school districts for conversion may contain historic buildings. He mentioned a few examples of historic buildings that are being considered for school conversion.

Mr. Winter suggested to the Committee that it not limit the building types and materials because it would greatly affect historic buildings.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Winter for his presentation.

IV. Presentation by Jim Watts, Architect, Facility Manager, San Diego Unified School District

Mr. Jim Watts began his discussion by explaining the size of the San Diego Unified School Districts. Their experience in non-Field Act buildings is in alternative schools and charter schools.

Mr. Watts mentioned an example in the 1980s when they looked at several non-Field Act buildings for conversion to be used as an alternative high school. They have also looked at several closed hospitals.

Mr. Watts said that they are will continue to explore their options including using non-Field Act buildings for schools. They are also considering looking at joint-use opportunities as San Diego continues to urbanize.

Mr. Gary McGavin asked if there would be more liability to a district if they used the IR process instead of getting DSA certification.

Commissioner Bill Gates said that he thought it would.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Watts for his presentation.

V. Presentation by Richard Luke, Director of Planning and Design, Los Angeles Unified School District

Mr. Luke started his presentation by saying that every potentional conversion project goes through the same steps as all other projects.

He said that he had to look at buildings that were 100% vacant for consideration due to several guidelines that say you can not co-locate with non-governmental entites.

Mr. Luke gave a few examples of projects that the LAUSD have done in the past.

Mr. Luke said that LAUSD has considerable experience with donated portable buildings. A requirement for their acceptance is stamped drawings.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 (916) 263-5506 (916) 263-0594 FAX

INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



Mr. Luke said that with LAUSD's future need, the use of non-Field act buildings is critical.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Luke for his presentation.

VI. Presentation by Ronald Young, Program Manager and Isela Lovato, Construction Manager, Pomona Unified School District

Ms. Isela Lovato and Mr. Ronald Young presented two case studies of Field Act conversion projects in their district.

The presentation began with the case study of the Pueblo Elementary school in Pomona, CA. This was the school that the Advisory Committee toured after its August meeting.

The other case study was on a project that the Pomona School district completed. The committee had several questions for Mr. Young and Ms. Lovato concerning the specifics of these studies.

Chairman Moy thanked Ms. Lovato and Mr. Young for their presentation.

VII. Presentation and Comments by other Unified School District Representatives

Chairman Moy asked any other school districts present if they wanted to make a statement to the committee.

Bob Arnold from San Mateo Unified High School District spoke on a specific project that they are considering converting. They are concerned about lowering the standards for historic structures and Mr. Arnold thought it was important to keep the highest level of safety possible.

Mr. Tom Duffy commented to Mr. Arnold that the committee is not their to diminish any standards, they are just there to determine if there is an alternative to building from the ground up.

Mr. Arnold also mentioned that funding is very important to these types of projects.

Mr. Michael Perez from San Bernardino City Unified School Districts had some questions for the committee concerning the Field Act. He also expressed some concerns that his district has due to lack of funds.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 (916) 263-5506

(916) 263-0594 FAX

ÎNTÉRNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



Mr. Ernest Silva from the California Network for Educational Charters said that they are hoping that this committee would create flexibility and opportunity for charter schools to comply with the Field Act and ensure the safety of the pupils.

Mr. Brad Strong with EdVoice mentioned that school districts clearly need more tools to address their facilities needs.

Mr. Isam Hasenin from the San Diego Building Department had a few concerns about charter schools and different requirements for those buildings.

VIII. Review of Current Draft Product Report

Chairman Moy started the discussion on the draft report of page eight of the document.

Mr. Henry Reyes explained that the overall justification section came from the input from the committee members and invited guests that have attended previous meetings.

He said staff's perception of "equivalent pupil safety performance" is equal to seismic performance due to this committee focusing around the Field Act.

Mr. Duffy felt that performance standards after a seismic event would be the ability to enter a building within weeks instead of months after an event.

Commissioner Dan Shapiro had some comments on the definition of equivalent performance standard and he stressed the word expectation. He would like an immediate comparison at the beginning of the report of equivalent pupil safety performance.

There were a few formatting comments made by committee members. (*These changes will be reflected in the Oct.31 draft product*)

Mr. Walt Schaff from the Department of Finance said that what was missing was a stronger justification section. He would like to see "what led you to your conclusion".

Mr. Dick Phillips says that the real difference in buildings is quality control.

The committee then discussed each recommendation listed in the draft. (Those changes suggested will be implemented in the Oct. 31 draft.)

Mr. Henry Reyes suggested that if Committee members had any other suggestions, they fax them into the Commission office.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45pm.